# INDEX

Of

# WITNESSES

MATAKURA, Tadashi (resumed)  Direct by Mr. T. OKAMOTO (cont'd) Direct (cont'd) by Mr. YAMADA  Cross by Mr. Tavenner  MORNING RECESS  Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)  NOON RECESS  Discussion re granting of Recess to Defense  AFTERNOON RECESS  Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)  Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO  (Witness excused)	Page	ense' Witnesses
Direct (cont'd) by Mr. YAMADA  Cross by Mr. Tavenner  MORNING RECESS  Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)  NOON RECESS  Discussion re granting of Recess to Defense  AFTERNOON RECESS  Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)  Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO	1904	KATAKURA, Tadashi (resumed)
MORNING RECESS  Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)  NOON RECESS  Discussion re granting of Recess to Defense  AFTERNOON RECESS  Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)  Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO	1904	Direct by Mr. T. OKAMOTO (cont'd) Direct (cont'd) by Mr. YAMADA
Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)  NOON RECESS  Discussion re granting of Recess to Defense  AFTERNOON RECESS  Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)  Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO	1906	Cross by Mr. Tavenner
NOON RECESS  Discussion re granting of Recess to Defense  AFTERNOON RECESS  Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)  Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO	1907	MORNING RECESS
Discussion re granting of Recess to Defense  AFTERNOON RECESS  Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd) Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO	19073	Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)
AFTERNOON RECESS  Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)  Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO	19090	NOON RECESS
Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd) Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO	19091	Discussion re granting of Recess to Defense
Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO	19099	AFTERNOON RECESS
	19102	Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)
(Witness excused)	19124	Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO
("I diress excused)	19126	(Witness excused)

Adjournment until Wednesday, 2 April 1947 19128

## Tuesday, 25 March 1947

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

### Appearances:

For the Tribunal, same as before with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE JARANILLA, Member from the Commonwealth of the Philippines, not sitting.

For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

M	1	MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
r	2	Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.
e	3	
&	4	TADA HI YATAKURA, called as a
W	5	witness on behalf of the defense, resumed
0 1 f	6	the stand and testified through Japanese
ľ	7	interpreters as follows:
	8	THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present
	9	except OKAWA and MATSUI who are represented by counsel.
	10	We have a certificate from the prison surgeon at
	11	Sugamo that MATSUI is too ill to attend the Trial
	12	today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.
	13	Mr. OKAMOTO.
	14	MR. T. OKAMOTO: I have just a few more
	15	questions to ask the witness.
	16	DIRECT EXAMINATION
	17	BY MR. T. OKAMOTO (Continued):
	18	Q Is the witness aware of the fact that in
	19	Manchuria there is a society called the Concordia
	20	cociety was formed?
	21	THE MONITOR: There was a Concordia Society
	22	in Manchuria.
	23	A Yes.
	24	Q Was the witness ever a member of the
	25	Committee of the Concordia rociety?

A Yes, when I was attached to the Fourth
Section of the Kwantung Army Headquarters I was
a member of the Central Committee.

Q Did you have any connection whatsoever with
the forming of the Concordia Society -- individually
any connection with the society at the time of its
establishment?

A Yes.

Q What connections did you have?

A There was a meeting of the Committee for
the establishment of the Concordia Society in Hsinking, Manchukuo on the 18th of July 1932. On that
occasion there was discussion about the formalities
or the ceremonies in connection with the inauguration

of the Society and for purposes of liaison two members -two representatives from the Kwantung Army, two
representatives from the Manchukuo Government and

six representatives from the Preparatory Committee of the Concordia bociety attended the meeting.

Q Then, will wouplease make it clear whether there is a difference between your participation in the meeting and the formation of the society?

THE INTERPRETER: The preparation for the establishment of the society.

THE MONITOR: Flight modification: Can you

explain whether there is a difference between attending this meeting and participating in the formation
of the Society? Is that one and the same thing or
not?

A The Committee for the Establishment of the Concerdia Society discussed various matters pertaining to the establishment of the Society, whereas, the actual preparations for the creation of the Society was handled by the Preparatory Committee, and, therefore, we had nothing to do with the formation of the Society.

Q Then, will you please tell us what duties you had when you were the Chief of the Fourth Section of the Kwantung Arm; and there was a member of the Central Committee?

THE MONITOR: And while you were a member of the Central Committee of the Concordia Society -- What were your duties as a central member of the Concordia Society?

A The Chief of the Fourth Section and before me the Chief of the Third Section was a member of the Central Committee of the Concordia -- for the establishment of the Concordia Society as a liaison officer between Kwantung Army Headquarters and the Society.

Q Does this -- the words liaison -- does the word "liaison" mean participation in the proceed-ings of the Society?

A At that time the Central Committee was more of an advisory organ and the decision was made by the Chairman of the Central Committee.

May I add a few words.

Beside -- in addition to myself, the other members who constituted the Central Committee for the Concordia society were the Consular of the Japanese Embassy, the Director General of the Kwantung Administrative Office and other Japanese officials with connections in Manchukuo, for the purpose of promoting the harmony of the various races in Manchukuo and also to foster Japan-Manchukuo collaboration.

Q "hat relation did the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army have therewith?

A Commanding General HONJO and the succeeding commanders-in-chief of the Kwantung Army for the most part were honerary advisors of the Concordia Society.

Q How many members participated therein from the Kwantung Army? How many members of the Committee were there representing the Kwantung Army?

A As members of the Central Committee, one or

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

two members of the Kwantung Army. Were there any other military officers 2 from the Kwantung Army represented in the Concordia Society who were members of the Concordia Society? None other than the Supreme Advisor to the Manchukuo Army. Were the members of the Japanese military allowed to participate in politics in Manchuria such as the Concordia Society? I am referring to officers and men generally. No, they were not permitted to participate. Q Do you know anything about the army -- the Manchukuo Government Army? A Yes.

24

4

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

Q Will you please tell us about the formation of the Manchurian Army -- Manchukuo Army -- national army?

A Generally speaking this may be -- the formation of the Manchukuo National Army may be divided into three stages.

Q Please explain to us briefly.

In the first stage representing the first period of the Manchukuo Army, at the outset, or in the early period of the establishment of the State of Manchukuo, the armies of the old Chang Hsueh-liang regime, the various armies belonging to the various provincial autonomous independent armies were gathered together principally for the purpose of maintaining law and order in Manchukuo, and also they were gathered for the purpose of improving their quality. In the second stage, which began around 1937, the Manchukuo state army and the Manchukuo police combined for the purpose of maintaining peace and order in Manchukuo. For this purpose the Department for the Maintenance of Law and Order was created and the army was devoted mainly to this task. In the third stage, which began around 1940, in response to an ardent desire of the people of Manchukuo, the conscription law was established and what would compare to a national defense

11

12

13 .

14

15

18

19

20

12

23

army was created, comprised of numerically small but very well trained and highly qualified officers and men.

Q You testified before that General Yu Chun-han did not recognize the necessity of a Manchukuo national army. From what you have just testified there seems to be some difference in the facts.

A There was a change in the thinking on the part of Yu Chun-han at the time he advocated a policy of no armies and at the time of which I have just testified. As a matter of fact, in the later stage, he favored the existence of a Manchukuo national army.

Q Do you know of the reason for the construction -establishment of a state in Manchuria by Japan? Do
you know why Japan approved of the formation of a
national army in Manchukuo?

A Yes.

Q What were they reasons?

A There were two views on the question.

Q Please state briefly.

A In the past in China there was a saying that good iron was not used for nails and, therefore, did not cultivate soldiery, and that good people are not taken into -- good people did not become soldiers.

However, in Manchukuo, the feeling grew, a national

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

fervor grew up in which they believed in respect for
the profession of arms, as a result of the growth
of a national consciousness in the new born state.
The second view was that in the light of the situation
along the Manchukuo border there was a strong feeling
among Manchurlans that they must be able through
strength using anti-aircraft artillery and other
weapons, to defend their borders, and Japan believed
that such a spirit was highly to be commended in the
sense that it was condusive to the principle of JapanManchukuo joint defense.

Q Japan had a considerable army in Manchuria. How were the expenses for this army taken care of?

A The cost, for the most part, came out of Japan's military expenditures.

Q You used the words "for the most part." Does that mean that a part of it was borne by the Manchukuo Government?

A As I testified yesterday it was at the behest of the Manchukuo Government that Manchukuo -- that is, by their own request, the Manchukuo Government wished to bear a part of the expenses for the stationing of Japanese troops in that country. There was an agreement arrived at, a promise made between the commanding general of the Kwantung Army, HISHIGARI, and

Cheng Hsiao-hsu in 1934 to the effect that Manchukuo would defray -- would pay for the expense of stationing Japanese troops to the extent of ten per cent of its national budget. This expenditure in the first year was no more than nine million yuan. However, this system was suspended in 1938.

0 What happened then?

A Since then the Manchukuo Government supplied such funds as it felt was necessary, while expenditures forthcoming from Japan was suspended, and suspended the ten per cent which previously had been given out of the Manchukuo state budget for the stationing of Japanese troops. This was carried out in 1938 during the time of UEDA, commanding general of the Kwantung Army, and I was section chief in charge of the matter.

Q In connection with this will you please tell us the steps taken by the Japanese in regard to the railway -- the lease of the railway?

MR. T. OKAMOTO: (In English) No, "loan."

A Before the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident the interest on railway loans was around 8 per cent, but after the establishment of the state of Manchukuo the interest rate decreased to 7.9 per cent. This was gradually decreased so that in 1939 when I was section

chief concerned, there were no interests on railway loans.

Q You testified that in the abrogation of extraterritoriality Japan made three reservations.
What were they? Is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q "ill you please explain the reservations made thereto:

A One was reservation with respect to military administration. At that time, seen from the Manchurian side, the Japanese residents in Manchuria were also Manchukuo subjects but at the same time, in accordance with Japanese law, they hadn't given up their Japanese nationality. Hence, under the constitution they -- military service -- they had the obligation of military service. The number of Japanese residents in Manchukuo was so large that a part of the business relating to them was handled by the Japanese side. The second reservation was with respect to educational administration.

Greenberg & Ed

е

r

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

O Please explain that briefly.

A Because of the fact that there were many Japanese residents in Manchukuo and because of the fact that there was so few educational facilities, the education of these people were for the time being left in Japanese hands. This was the second reservation.

Q Next?

A Next was in connection with the administration of railway zone. Because of the fact that most of the shrines were left in the railway zone the administration thereof was left in the hands of the Japanese for the time being.

O Did you participate in the formation of the Manchuria Heavy Industries Company?

A I did not participate in its formation.

Q Did you take any part in the development of the Manchuria Meavy Industries Company thereafter? Have you, Mr. Witness, contributed any of your efforts in the development of the Manchuria Heavy Industries Company thereafter?

A Yes, I gave them my positive cooperation as chief of the fourth section, Kwantung Army headquarters.

O Will you tell us briefly what you know about

this company?

A In connection with the aim of the formation of this company there was opposition both in Man-churia and Japan. In Manchuria there was opposition on the part of the South Manchuria railroad because of the fact that a very important economic activity had been taken away from them, and opposition also on the part of the younger officials of the Man-chukuo government out of a divergence of views on how to apply planned economy.

Opposition in Japan came forth from various Japanese industrial enterprises out of their envy of Mr. ARUKAWA, Yoshisuke. The extreme nationalists in Japan were opposed to the creation of this company because they felt that the enticing of foreign capital into Manchukuo would lead to a second Harriman incident.

O Did the Kwantung Army express any opposition to the importation of foreign capital?

A Ever since the outbreak of the Manchurian incident the Kwantung Army has always advocated in favor of importation of foreign capital and it has never been opposed.

O What attitude did the Kwantung Army take with respect to the open door policy in Manchuria --

1	open door policy in Manchukuo?
2	A Has never opposed that policy.
3	Q Until when were you the chief of the
4	fourth section?
5	A Until August 1939.
6	Did you go to Manchukuo after that?
7	A In July 1941, as a senior staff of General
8	YAMASHITA, Hobun, I went to the Kwantung defense
9	headquarters.
10	O Please tell us the mission you had then
11	the duties you had then.
12	A The Kwantung defense army was under the
13	commander in chief of the Kwantung Army, General
14	UMEZU, and was assigned to the defense of Kulunbur
5	and Hei-ho, or to the defense areas outside of the
6	Manchukuo border.
7	O Where did you learn of the outbreak of the
8	Greater East Asia War?
9	
0	and the second s
1	about the effect of
2	the outbreak of the Greater East Asia War upon the
3	people of Manchuria or Manchukuo?
4	A My observations while in Manchukuo was
5	While at first the neonle of Manchukua wome wome

ready in every readiness to cooperate with Japan

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

but with the steady demands placed by Japan on the material from Manchukuo there began to grow some dissatisfaction on the part of the people. O You testified very accurately on various questions on Manchuria. Did you make any particular study of this question? A As is quite evident from my career, I have gone to Manchuria and Manchukuo many times and I have assisted in the compilation of the history of the Manchurian incident. Slight correction: I have been frequently associated with Manchurian affairs and I was assistant -- I served as assistant in the compilation of the history of the Manchurian incident which was compiled by the general staff office. MR. T. OKAMOTO: I now conclude my examination in chief. May I have the permission to recall this witness for the personal phase of defendant MINAMI? THE PRESIDENT: He will be subject to be recalled if that is desired. MR. T. OKAMOTO: Mr. YAMADA, counsel for

defendant ITAGAKI, would like to put a few

questions as addition to the direct examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. YAMADA.

3

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

21

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

#### 2 BY MR. YAMADA:

With regard to the suggestions made by the Kwantung Army to the central authorities, were these carried out in toto?

A Yes, those which were adopted were carried out.

With regard to these suggestions, were there any instructions from the central government to make these suggestions?

THE MONITOR: Slight correction: With regard to these recommendations made by the Kwantung Army to the central authorities, were there always instructions from the central authorities concerning this?

Yes, there were directions on matters which required a reply.

Did the Kwantung Army always obey the orders -the instructions of the central authorities?

Yes, we were always obedient to the orders of the central authorities, and we were absolutely obedient to the all Imperial commands. However, if 24 the directions -- directives from the central authorities were not -- were at variance with the opinions and views entertained by the Kwantung Army, then the

Kwantung Army would repeat its presentation of its views to the central authorities.

Q The Imperial orders that you mention now, what were they? What sort of orders were they?

A It is an order issued by the chief of the Army General Staff in his capacity as the assistant to the Emperor in the -- in carrying out the Imperial prerogative of the Supreme Command -- an order issued by the chief of the Army General Staff at the instructions of the Emperor.

Q Colonel ITAGAKI met Ma Chan-shan in Hai-lun. Could a staff officer of the Kwantung Army hold such meetings with such people whenever they wanted to do so merely in his personal capacity?

A There were two attitudes held by the staff officers with respect to the outside: In the case of Colonel ITAGAKI meeting Ma Chan-shan in Hai-lun, being a very important question, he would go -- he will meet such a person at the directions and instructions of the commander-in-chief of the Kwantung Army. However, in case of a less important matter, the staff officer may, on his own, for purposes of collecting and gathering intelligence and other data, do so at his personal discretion.

THE MONITOR: That is, of course, when he is

25

1	under some general mission to accomplish to attain
2	certain ends.
3	Q In carrying out such important negotiations,
4	were official reports made after such negotiations?
5	A Naturally.
6	Q With regards to the rebuilding of the bridge
7	which was destroyed by Ma Chan-shan the bridge
8	over the Nun-Kiang
9	What steps did the Japanese take with regard
10	to the rebuilding of the bridge which was destroyed
11	bridge over the Nun-Kiang by forces of General Ma
12	Chan-shan?
13	THE MONITOR: Which was destroyed by the
14	forces of General Ma Chan-shan when Chang Hai-peng's
15	army advanced to the north.
16	A Towards the end of October, negotiations were
17	begun with respect to the repairing of the bridge at
18	the request of the South Manchuria Railway.
19	Q What happened after that?
20	A At first the directive the South Manchuria
21	Railway asked for the repair of the bridge for the
22	purpose of hauling grain. President UCHIPA. presi-
23	dent of the South Manchuria Railway, while making this
24	de of one bount manerial ta natinay, writte making this

request to the commander-in-chief, HONJO, also, at the

same time, through Consul General HAYASHI, submitted

25

ments.

1	a request to Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA asking that
2	negotiations be begun for the repair of the bridge.
3	Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA wired instructions to
4	Consul General HAYASHI, and the negotiations were
5	commenced by Consul SHIMIZU at Tsitsihar.
6	Q What happened after that?
7	A Then negotiations were continued.
8	Q Was the repairs carried out were the re-
9	pairs carried out finally?
10	A With the despatch of the repair corps, fight-
11	ing began.
12	Q With regards to the question of the personnel
13	of the Manchukuo Government, what powers did the
14	Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army have?
15	A The Chief of Staff assisted the commanding
16	general in recommending Japanese officials to the
17	Manchukuo Government.
18	Q Then the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army
19	had connections simply because to the extent that
20	recommendations to the extent that he carried out
21	the will of the commander-in-chief of the Kwantung
22	Army with regards to recommendations or suggestions
23	

A As far as the actual personnel question was

with regard to -- in connection with personnel move-

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

concerned, officials were actually recommended by the director or president of the General Affairs Board and submitted for -- to the commander-in-chief of the Kwantung Army.

THE MONITOR: They were actually recommended by the director-general of the General Affairs Bureat on the Manchukuo side and was recommended -- and this was -- information was transmitted to the Kwantung Army; and, in accordance with the will of the Commanderin-Chief of the Kwantung Army, the Chief of Staff transmitted the same to Japan proper, submitting a request.

I believe you testified to the effect that you did not have any direct conversations with the members of the Lytton Commission. Did you or did you not have direct conversations with the members thereof?

I testified yesterday that I had discussions with members of the Lytton Commission at the Yamato Hotel in Mukden.

With regard to the explanation of various matters and guiding the reception of the Lytton Commission, who was in charge -- who in the Kwantung Army was in charge of this?

24 MR. TAVENNER: I object, your Honor, to this question because it was a matter covered by the person

who examined in chief. THE PRESIDENT: Not only that, but it seems 2 irrelevant and immaterial. He is not attacking any 3 findings of the Commission now. Objection upheld. 4 MR. YAMADA: I conclude my examination. I 5 would like to reserve the right to call this witness 6 when the individual defense of my client, ITAGAKI, begins. THE PRESIDENT: Your interests are fully protected in that regard. Mr. Tavenner, do you contemplate a lengthy cross-examination? After all, the phases touched on by this witness are well documented from Japanese sources apart from the Lytton Report. However, you use your own judgment. MR. TAVENNER: I do not contemplate asking a great many questions; but the answers given may call for further questioning.

19

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22 23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### CROSS-EXAMINATION

### BY MR. TAVENNER:

Q General KATAKURA, what military rank did you hold while you were in Manchuria from August 1930 to the end of August 1932?

A Captain.

Q What were your duties as staff officer during that period?

A As I have explained before, at first I was an assistant in charge of public relations and liaison with the outside, the handling of clerical matters within the Headquarters of the Kwantung Army, and later on, as staff officer, the various types of activities which I have already described. And also during this period I served in a secretarial capacity both to the Commander-in-Chief and the Chief of Staff.

Q Are Kuanchengtze and Nanlin located in the Province of Kirin?

A Yes, located in Kirin Province.

Q You testified, page 18,908 of the transcript, that troops were dispatched to Kirin because of a report received on September 20 of the existence of a state of disorder and unrest at that place. Why did you fail to mention that Japanese troops attacked

the Chinese garrisons of Kuanchengtze and Nanlin in 1 the province of Kirin at midnight on the 18th? I did not mention it because I wasn't asked the question. But if required, I should be very 4 happy to explain. Why did you fail to tell the Tribunal that 6 Chinese troops at Antung, Yingkow, Liaoyang and other 7 smaller towns were overcome and disarmed on the 8 night of September 18? 9 Chinese troops at Feng Huan-cheng and Yingkow 10 were disarmed, but there was no attack on Chinese 11 troops at Antung or Liaoyang. 12 I asked you why you did not tell the Tribunal 13 about the unarming of these troops at those places. 14 I did not speak of it because there was no 15 16 question from defense counsel. However, I am prepared to reply. Do you understand English? Q A No. Why didn't you tell the Tribunal that on the night of the 18th of September the Japanese fleet was ordered to proceed from Port Arthur to Yingkow and reinforcements were requested from Korea?

24 25

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I did not speak of them because there was no question from defense counsel. But if you would like me to speak of them, I shall be able to speak of them in detail.

THE PRESIDENT: The only purpose this crossexamination serves is to remind us of the prosecution's evidence.

24 ,

I would like to read you just three short excerpts from the Lytton Report on page 71--MR. BROOKS: I wish to object, your Honor. 3 The Lytton Report is in evidence, and the prosecution later can refer to it, and he has proper time to present 5 his argument to the Court at that time. I call this 6 . matter to the attention of the Tribunal. I think 7 it is improper to go into that unless there is some 8 question of testing the witness' credibility here, 9 10 and he has failed to let this witness answer and give 11 the explanations on these points. 12 THE PRESIDENT: You are out of order, Captain Brooks, the objection should be taken by the Japanese 14 counsel who examined in chief. MR. BROOKS: I was appointed by the counsel 16 to work with Mr. OKAMOTO for objections, as we explained in chambers, your Honor. I am working with Mr. OKAMOTO, 18 that is why I am here every day. 19 THE PRESIDENT: We understand you do not represent the same interests. 21

MR. BROOKS: We do represent the same interests, your Honor. I represent General MINAMI as American counsel and he represents him as Japanese counsel. Colonel Warren as chairman asked me to take the objections.

13

15

17

20

22

23

THE PRESIDENT: However, it is clear that
the cross-examining counsel is within his rights in
putting his evidence to this witness. That is one
of the main purposes of cross-examination. But in this
particular case it seems to me to be a waste of time, and
as I said before Captain Brooks intervened.

MR. TAVENNER: I will withdraw the question.

Q You testified on page 18929 of the transcript that the Kwantung Army had no connection whatsoever with the organization of the committee for the maintenance of peace and order. How can you reconcile that statement with the finding of the Lytton Report on page 89 where it is said with reference to Mr. Yuan Chin-kai: "The Japanese military authorities invited him and eight other Chinese residents to form a 'Committee for the Maintenance of Peace and Order.'"

A As I have said before, the Liaoning committee for the maintenance of peace and order was formed by these men, and they later came to the Kwantung Army headquarters in connection with the appointment of a Japanese adviser to that committee. I am speaking from my personal knowledge and recollection, and I say that Kwantung Army headquarters, or the army itself, has never at any time on its own taken any part in the formation or organization of such a

2

3

4

21

7

5

9

e 1 d

e

n

3

S

pr

t

11

12

14

16 17

12

19

2.1

22

24

25

committee.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued):

Q How can you reconcile your statement that the Kwantung Army had no connection whatsoever with the organization of the Committee for the Maintenance of Peace and Order with your later statement appearing at page 19,003 of the transcript, where you said:

"It was the intention of the Tokyo authorities that the Kwantung Army on the spot keep in close contact with various local regimes and keep and preserve law and order in various parts of Manchuria."

A The Kwantung Army has had nothing to do at all with the establishment of these committees for the maintenance of peace and order. However, it maintained contact and liaison with committees

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

after they were established in order to seek their cooperation in the maintenance of law and order because the Kwantung Army did not establish military administration. As I told the defense 4 counsel, at about the time that Colonel ITAGAKI made a trip to Tokyo, that is, around January, 6 1932, the Kwantung Army maintained contact and sought the cooperation of the leaders of the various provincial governments in Manchuria. If I may put my point briefly, it is this: it had nothing to do with the formation or creation or the establishment of these committees, but it did maintain contact with these committees after they were established.

I would be very happy for you to answer in brief form, and putting it in brief form doesn't it just mean this: that the Kwantung Army was not permitted to be present at the birth of the new organization, but was to act as its nursemaid until its maturity?

The Kwantung Army was not at all a nursemaid of these committees for the maintenance of peace and order. According to the old Chinese custom and practice such a committee after it is formed is a full-fledged adult.

25 ,

1	Q Now did the Kwantung Army then nurse
2	through infancy the organization known as the
3	Self-Government Guiding Board, or was it, too,
4	
	born a full man?
5	A In the case of the Self-Government Guid-
6	ing Board there was some slight difference. The
7	Self-Government Building Board was created in the
8	various localities, that is, the provinces or
9	lesser and smaller localities, and in order to
10	foster and promote the growth of the Self-Governmen
11	Guiding Board, Manchurians, some Japanese under the
12	leadership of Yu Chun-han, that is, for the purpose
13	of promoting and fostering the Self-Government
14	Guiding Board, a committee was created under the
15	leadership of Yu Chun-han, composed of Manchurians
16	and some Japanese.
17	Q Now, the object of this Guiding Board was
18	
19	to promote independence movements, was it not?
20	A With regard to this, there were two
21	changes.
22	Q Let me interrupt you. I am not asking for
23	changes. Will you please answer the question that
24	I have asked you?

The original and former aim of the Self-

Government Guiding Board was to serve in the

capacity of a Guiding Board with regard to selfgovernment, but from January 1932 it started an enlightment movement in connection with the forming of a new state.

Q Then the principal object was to promote the formation of a new state from January on?

A Its principal function was to serve in a guiding capacity for local self-government, guiding committees or boards, and at the same time it started an enlightment movement in connection with the creation of a new state.

May I add a few words to this? In

January 1932 Yu Chun-han and Tsang Shih-i had a
meeting in connection with the establishment of
a new state. Also, in January 1932 the province
of Heilunkiang proclaimed its independence, and
thereafter various other provinces in Manchuria
declared their independence and gradually took on
a more consolidated form.

Q How early in September was it that this Self-Governing 'Guidance Board was established? The word is "Self-Government," not "Self-Governing."

A My recollection is that the Self-Government Guiding Board was inaugurated on the 10th of November, 1931.

5

2

3

4

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

	Q You spoke of the committee being organized
1	under a Chinese; is that correct?
2	A Yes.
3	Q And that there were a few Japanese on this
4	committee also?
5	Q Yes.
6	Q How many were on the committee as a whole?
7	A You mean Japanese?
8	Q No, what was the entire membership of the
9	committee, 120?
10	A I do not remember the figure exactly; maybe
11	around one hundred.
12	
13	committee, stated that it was a committee of 120,
14	would you deny it?
15	
16	A I do not recall the number but I should
17	think it is around it was about one hundred so
18	that would be pretty close to that figure.
19	Q Now, of the 100 or 120 members of this cem-
20	mittee, isn't it a fact that only about 15 were
21	Chinese or Manchurians and the rest of them were
22	Japanese?
23	A I do not think that the number was so few.
24	If I am permitted to explain a little further, the
	Self-Government Guiding Board in the various provinces

were broken down and, for instance, in the Province of Fengtien or Mukden Province there were more than 20 hsiens with subcommittees under this Guiding Board. I would like to interrupt the witness here 5 because your explanation has nothing to do with the question I was asking. This Self-Government Guiding 7 Board was broken down into about eight divisions for operational purposes, wasn't it? 9 A I think about five sections. 10 Are you familiar with the section entitled 11 "General Affairs Section"? 12 As I have said before, I am not familiar 13 with the details because the problem of maintenance 14 of law and order was in the hands of the third section 15 of the Kwantung Army headquarters and I was with the 16 fourth section handling press relations and, therefore, 17 I was not personally or directly connected with the 18 affair. 19 You were with the fourth section in 1931 and 20 1932? 21 I was in the General Affairs Section as assist-22 ant to Colonel ITAGAKI. 23 Q Were you in the fourth section in 1931 or '32? 24 Α No. 25 Q Then why did you say that you were?

I was in the fourth section in December 1937. Because of the fact that there are many very great changes in the organization of the Kwantung Army headquarters, depending on the time, the function of the fourth section would be different. If necessary, I should be very glad to explain the particular section which was charged with the handling of Manchurian affairs. Q I did not ask you that question. I asked 10 you if you were familiar with the General Affairs Section of the Self-Government Guiding Board and you 12 stated you were not because you were in section four 13 when matters relating to the general affairs of the 14 Self-Governing Board were handled by section three. You state now you were a member of section three, so tell us about the operations -- that is, the operations of the general affairs branch of the Self-Government 18 Guiding Board. 19 I am not familiar with the functions of the 20 General Affairs Section of the Self-Government Guiding 21 Board. 22 You do know, however, that it was controlled 23 entirely by the Japanese, do you not? 24 There were many Japanese associated with it

but I would not say it was entirely Japanese.

As a matter of fact, General, did not the Kwantung Army sponsor and do everything it could to promote the independence movements in Manchuria? 3 A As I told defense counsel, the Kwantung Army, that is, Commanding General HONJO expressed his opinion to the Central authorities in November and forwarded his recommendations in January and in that connection there were studies made by the Kwantung Army. However, as far as the ections of the Kwantung Army were concerned this was to be taken after consultation with Tokyo and in accordance with the development of the 12 situation in Manchukuo, the action to be taken to be 13 in consideration of the need as it arose, and they 14 were so taken. What do you mean by the need as it arose? A I have already spoken of the fact that the 17 attitude of the Kwantung Army underwent three changes. Will you answer my question, please? What 19 do you mean by the statement, "as the need arose"? A As a result of consultation with Tokyo in 21 1932 the Central authorities in Tokyo were opposed to 22 an independent state; however, it was not opposed to the

23 establishment of a unified regime. At that time there

was a cabinet change in Japan and therefore a change

in government policy resulting and also a change in

the deployment of forces of the Kwantung Army in Manchuria and, therefore, for these various reasons various steps had to be taken whenever necessary. For instance, it may be said that as a result of Colonel ITAGAKI's meeting with the prominent leaders of Manchuria in various areas of that country and as a result of his assurance given to them at those interviews that Japan had no intentions of occupying Manchuria nor that Japan had entertained any territorial designs on Manchuria, it may be said that this assurance given by Colonel ITAGAKI served as a sort of a suggestion to them in their carrying on their independence movement.

Goldberg & Kapleau

The Manchurian leaders did not desire the return of the Chang regime to Manchuria or the extension of the authority of the Nanking Government into Manchuria. At the same time the wantung Army also did not desire the establishment of such authority in Manchuria and in fact -- and, therefore, Colonel ITAGAKI's telling these men, prominent Manchurian leaders, of Japan's true intentions not to occupy nor to take the territory of Manchukuo, that may have served as an impetus to these Manchurian leaders to do something themselves, and in that sense it may be said that indirectly there was some stimulus given in carrying on the independence movement.

Q Let me interrupt your speech, Mr. Witness, and ask that you answer my question, which is:

What did you mean by the statement that independence movements were aided by the Kwantung Army as the need arose?

THE PRESIDENT: We must assume that your questions are being correctly interpreted. If so, you may be satisfied to leave the position as it is now if this question is directed to testimony credit. We do not need the confirmation of this witness of your evidence. You are not inviting his contradiction.

1	
1	You are merely testing credit, and perhaps you have done
2	enough of that.
3	MR. TAVENNER: I withdraw the question.
4	Q At this point I would like to ask you a few
5	questions about occurrences prior to the so-called
6	Incident. Did not the Kwantung Army on or prior to
7	August 18, 1931 drive Yen Hsi-shan from the Kwantung
8	Province by the use of airplanes?
9	THE MONITOR: Mr. Tavenner, did you say,
10	"drive from by airplanes"? You mean drive him out
11	of the place by the use of airplanes as a force?
12	MR. TAVENNER: That is right.
13	A I do not think there was any case of his
14	being driven out.
15	Q Was there an attack upon this person by
16	the use of airplanes?
17	A No.
18	Q Did not the value of Manchurian railroad
19	stocks suddenly fall on July 20, 1931 due to rumors
20	of a Manchurian expedition?
21	A I have never heard of stocks falling because
22	of an expedition a military expedition.
23	Q Was Shih Yu-san opposed to the Nanking regime
24	THE MONITOR: Mr. Tavenner, what is your
25	spelling of the name, please?
	M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M

MR. TAVENNER: S-h-i-h Y-u--s-a-n.

A I am not familiar with that situation because I was not then connected with intelligence duties with regard to Chinese affairs.

Q Possibly I can refresh your recollection.

Did not DOHIHARA aid him in his opposition to the

Nanking regime?

A May I have that question repeated?

(Whereupon, the question was repeated by the interpreter.)

A No, I do not know.

Q You have told us that because of your duties with the staff of the Kwantung Army that you were familiar with everything that occurred or practically everything.

A What I personally handled in connection with the Manchurian Incident, what took place at the conference of staff officers, what I personally heard from the Commanding General of the Kwantung Army, indeed, I am very well familiar with. Other than these things, there might be certain matters with which I am not familiar. There might be many things with which I am not familiar.

Q Do you not recall that DOHIHARA was recalled to Mukden because of the aid he gave to the forces of

8

10

11

1.2

13

15

16

10

20

21

22

23

24

Shih Yu-san prior to the breaking out of the Incident?

A No, I do not know.

Q Is it not a fact that prior to the so-called Incident the army attempted to use the killing of Captain NAKAMURA as a tool for solving the Manchurian-Mongolian problems by enlarging its importance?

A I am very well familiar with the NAKAMURA Incident because I personally handled it, but there was nothing of that sort connected with it. However, it is a fact that at the time newspapers in Manchuria and Japan exaggerated the activities of the Chinese side because they were indignant over the actions of the Chinese toward the Japanese -- toward Japanese subjects.

You told us in your examination in chief that shortly after the breaking out of the so-called Incident, many actions were taken by the Kwantung Army for the maintenance of law and order. You also referred to the action of the Cabinet in Tokyo in March, 1932. Was this program or attempt to restore law and order in line with the recommendations of the Cabinet, a copy of which you said was sent to the Kwantung Army?

A No, that is different.

hat is the difference?

Incident the Kwantung Army took necessary action in the despatching of troops for the purpose of maintaining law and order, which is a natural thing for any army to do in the face of such a contingency. The cabinet decision of March, 1932, was referred to the Kwantung Army as a matter of reference, and this does not bind the Kwantung army and its activities, or, that is, this recommendation was not binding on the Kwantung Army.

O Did the Kwantung Army carry out the matter which had been referred to them by the cabinet?

Yes, the Kwantung Army received the cabinet decision as reference, but the Kwantung Army acted according to the instructions of the Chief of the Army General Staff and the War Minister in Tokyo.

O Had not the Kwantung Army been acting in accordance with that same instruction from the very beginning?

A The action taken by the Kwantung Army at the time of the outbreak of the Incident came as a result of the personal decision of the Commanding General of the Kwantung Army. It was after that that

9087 Misking cerresponding pages in the recerd. pages and should be substituted for the The attached pages are corrected. ;; 25 march sy Maginak a some o CROSS KATAKUBA 19,082 I would like to change the wording of this a little, and I will come to the reading of this later.

THE MONITOR: We have it, Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: I still prefer to change
the question.

THE MONITOR: All right, sir.

Is it not a fact, Mr. Witness, that the cabinet endeavored to use the right of subjugating bandits and the policy of protecting nationals as an excuse for seizing military power in Manchuria?

MR. BROOKS: I would like to object to that, your Honor. I think it calls for an opinion outside the scope of this witness' knowledge.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled. His credit can be tested this way.

You had better read the cabinet's minutes.

As I have said before, the Kwantung Army has not acted in accordance with that cabinet decision. In accordance with the situation then developing in Manchuria, the Kwantung Army acted in accordance with the directions of the Chief of the Army General Staff in Tokyo, and that action was to preserve and maintain law and order. The Kwantung Army on its own did not engage in anything such as the grasping of military power.

2

3 4

6

7 8

10

11 12

13

14

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need for him, of course, to confirm the cabinet minutes. come from the principal source of power in Japan. You can only be using this to test credit, and why persist in it?

MR. TAVENNER: The witness testified that the Kwantung / rmy had received a copy of this -of the minutes of this cabinet meeting.

THE PRESIDENT: My point is, you are just testing credit, needlessly, I think. You don't went confirmation.

MR. T/VENNER: I will not pursue that subject matter further.

- You testified that ANDO was sent from Tokyo to Manchuria to investigate certain matters. That was the date of his arrival?
  - The 22nd of September.
- You stated that the second subject of his inquiry related to a report that the Kwantung Army had attacked the Chinese inspite of the Chinese declaration of non-resistance. Do you know who made that report to Tokyo prior to the 22nd of September?
- If we assume that this report was sent out by the Consulate General -- the Japanese Consulate

25 march 83

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected. pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

19.047/19.128

ger worth of an east broad on the fire vetural waster our to other constitutions bear and bear

The west your and annual them you he malt has look

to base of the parties or design that about

where the state of the state of the state of the state of

General in Mukden when we had a discussion at the 1 time of the investigation with the Counsul General there --THE MONITOR: I received the impression thet --5 THE INTERPRETER: It was our impression 6 that the report was sent out by the Japanese Con-7 sulate General in Mukden when we had a discussion --8 judging from the discussion I had with them there. Well, it is a fact, is it not, that Colonel 10 ITACAKI knew at the time of the outbreak of the 11 Incident that the Chinese had declared a non-resis-12 13 tance policy? Not from what Colonel ITACAKI reported to 14 the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army or from 15 16 what he spoke to me about. 17 THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until helf-18 past one. 19 (Whereupon, et 1158 a recess was 20 taken.) 21 22 23

23

25

1 General in Mukden when we had a discussion at the 2 time of the investigation with the Counsul General 3 there --4 THE MONITOR: I received the impression that --THE INTERPRETER: It was our impression 7 that the report was sent out by the Japanese Con-8 sulate General in Mukden when we had a discussion --9 judging from the discussion I had with them there. 10 Well, it is a fact, is it not, that Colonel 11 ITAG/KI knew at the time of the outbreak of the 12 Incident that the Chinese had declared a non-resis-13 tence policy? 14 Not from what Colonel ITAGAKI reported to 15 the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army or from 16 what he spoke to me about. 17 THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half-18 pest one. 19 (Whereupon, at 1158 a recess was taken 20 until 1330.) 21 22 23

2

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1330.

## AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please:

I have the unanimous consent and approval of all counsel, defense counsel, to read a short prepared statement to the Tribunal at this time concerning the recess.

Yesterday the defense, in open court, requested an adjournment for one week in order that we might be enabled to carry on with the burdens of proceeding in a manner consistent with the proper defense of the accused. We had previously stated our position in Chambers and we listened with interest to the additional remarks of the prosecution. We feel the Tribunal is fully informed in the premises and we, therefore, deem it inappropriate to comment further upon the remarks of the prosecution.

We have observed with misgivings an apparent tendency to deviate from methods of procedure unon which we had come to rely. This came about as a result of having followed such procedures during the time the prosecution was presenting its evidence.

The Tribunal stated yesterday that it was prepared to grant a recess of seven days at the end of the present witness' testimony, providing that "future witnesses for the defense will give evidence on affidavit; and that there will be no further application for recess until Junc." The prosecution presented the testimony of witnesses by affidavit over the objection of the defense. It was obviously a definite aid to the prosecution to be able to thus control its direct testimony, and their action was entirely voluntary. The defense does not feel that the immosition of such a rule as is proposed would be of any benefit to the accused. On the contrary, we feel that the restriction would be such as to work great hardship. Be that as it may, the fact remains that in order to effectuate and vitalize a restriction of that character, it would consume more time then the defense has presently requested, and would place an additional burden on our already overtaxed language section, and would of itself require an additional request for time.

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

With respect to the proposition that we should not ask for any further recess until June, we have already made our position clear. We cannot give 25 the Tribunal any assurance that we could continue until such time. The contingencies are much too speculative

upon which to prognosticate with any degree of certainty.

1

2

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is with deep regret that the defense now feels compelled to state that it is in no position to compromise what we consider to be the basic rights of the accused to a fair and impartial trial.

THE PRESIDENT: The insistence by the Tribunal on affidavits by the defense witnesses cannot prejudice a fair trial of the accused. On the contrary, it gives an advantage to the accused, and we know it if you don't. There is no jury here. The deponents will take the box and be subjected to cross-examination end re-examination. All that will happen will be that the witness will give his examination, his direct examination or the evidence therein, after careful consideration and that direct examination will be simultaneously broadcast. The only change involved will be to the advantage of the accused and not to the disadvantage of the accused. When this matter was before me in Chembers there was not a single word of dissent and this is a new attitude. I believe Mr. Cunningham had something to say, but he is one in fifty. Apparently he has control. If you don't want the recess on our terms, you won't get the recess.

The application for the recess is refused.

Mr. Cunningham.

would like to make myself clear on the objections.

At our recent meeting I voiced the same objections to the conditions imposed by the Tribunal as I voiced in Chambers when the matter came up originally, and the opposition voiced at that time is practically the same as the opposition voiced in our meeting unanimously yesterday concerning the restriction imposed by the Tribunal, and since the objections have not been made a part of the record it might be proper to voice the reason why we object to the immosition of having our testimony reduced to affidavit form before presented before the Tribunal as the evidence in this case.

There were three major reasons why the objections to the introduction of our testimony in affidavit prompted me in objecting at that time and also at this time to that imposition.

THE PRESIDENT: The spokesman for the great majority expressed no word of dissent. However, apparently they have changed. You have convinced them, Mr. Cunningham. It is a great triumph for you and it will be interesting for us to know how you did it, so you better tell us.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I assure you, your Honor, that I don't deserve the credit, but I would like to give you the reasons why these matters seem so fundamental.

The first was that they thought that under the Charter the counsel should have the right to elect the most effective manner in which to present the evidence in behalf of his client.

Two, that it is far more effective according to our experience to have a witness testify forthright in the court rather than recite his evidence by affidavit form; and, third, that it is such a radical departure from the ordinary course of presentation of a case when a man's life is at stake that it seems so impractical and improbable that such a rule should be adopted.

THE PRESIDENT: Words, just words; no attempt to show us how the accused will be prejudiced because there is no possibility of showing it.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, my

colleagues have asked me to point out that many of them were not present at the meeting in chambers. As I recall, your Honor, you stated that the rule was likely to be imposed and we tried to work out or formulate a basis which would be least objectionable to the defense. At least, your Honor, the decision yesterday, or at least the conclusion the Tribunal reached yesterday, with regard to the handling of the witnesses was far more far-reaching than what we discussed in chambers. If there was no objection other than from Mr. Cunningham certainly there was no agreement to it.

Certainly, your Honor, I pointed out personally that the prosecution proceeded in that manner because they so chose to do. Of what use is there to voice an objection if the mind of the Tribunal is made up. It could only antagonize your Honor and we shouldn't do so. The accused will be endangered in this respect.

If it please your Honor, the additional physical burden placed upon the defense counsel and upon their assistants will place us far beyond the breaking point at which we are now. Many of us have worked hard and diligently and ofttimes we were not physically able to do so, and to put this increased burden on us is going to affect our overall preparation of this

Trial by the defense. It may well be, your Honor, that given the time to prepare these affidavits, and the facilities with which to prepare them, that it might not work a hardship on the accused. Otherwise, sir, it certainly shall.

THE PRESIDENT: You must, of course, take
a proof of the evidence of every witness and all we
are asking is that you put that proof in affidavit
form and serve it three days beforehand on us. Actually,
no extra burden is involved beyond going before a
Commissioner of Affadivits or a Justice of the Peace
and swearing on oath that what is in the proof is
true. Before a witness goes into that box you get
a statement from him in writing. All we want you to
do is to have it sworn to and circulated. That
involves no extra effort on your part, neither
physical nor mental. I have been over 40 years
associated with criminal work. I have been on both
sides and I know.

.

Greenberg & Whalen

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, I will personally invite any Member of this Tribunal to visit and see the processes through which a document must go before it can be placed before this Tribunal. It is not as simple as your Honor seems to think. Believe me, sir, if it were that simple, I would not be pleading for time; I would be out working and getting it done. But it just is not that simple, your Honor.

I invite the personal attention of the Members of this Tribunal to the lengthy red tape through which we must go. I said "red tape." Perhaps I should not have done so. I meant the procedure which, apparently, is necessary to the conduct of a trial of this nature and the scope that it covers. And it will, your Honor, increase the burden. I say that sincerely and honestly.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner, will you continue the cross-examination.

I will take a vote on this if there is any question about it. We granted the seven days recess on terms. The terms have been rejected, and I cannot see how we can be held to granting seven days now.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, we have attempted

to explain that the terms are such that the recess would be useless. At the end of a week's time we probably would not be any further ahead because we have some twenty-eight witnesses that we will use in the first sub-division. Our trial notes are not sufficient to bring before this Tribunal. We cannot, your Honor -- we do not have these things translated. We must call the witnesses back in.

Your Honor, we are doing everything we can to shorten this procedure. Just today at noon we discussed and have agreed to attempt to stipulate many matters of fact, as your Honor suggested the other day. I think it has met with the instant approval of all defense counsel.

the president: You know my attitude in chambers, Colonel Warren. Here I am supporting the attitude of the Court. If the Court wants to change its attitude, it is at liberty to do so; I shall loyally observe whatever they direct. The decision yesterday was the decision of the whole Tribunal. There was not a single dissentient.

We will adjourn to consider the matter.

(Whereupon, at 1407, a recess was taken until1445 after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Duda & Whalen

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: The Court has come to a final decision on the matter of a recess to enable the defense to continue their case.

The Court grants a recess of seven days
from the completion of the evidence of the witness
now in the box. The Court insists on future defense
witnesses giving their evidence on affidavit.
The Court will investigate the allegations made by
the defense that they are lacking facilities for this
work.

I ask that the defense counsel then be authorized as officers of the Court to administer sufficient oath to take affidevits in order to save time, simplify procedure, and overcome in some degree the handicap which we feel is the result of the ruling?

THE PRESIDENT: The Charter expressly deals with oaths and affirmations to be taken by witnesses. So far as the Charter is lacking and we have the power. we will provide what is necessary by rules of Court.

Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: Your Honor, may I make this suggestion in the interests of saving time with regard

to affidavits: In every instance in which an affidavit has been introduced, or nearly every one, the affiant has stated on the stand under oath that the matters 3 contained in his statement are true.

THE PRESIDENT: Independently of that there are reasons why we should have the statements in affidavit form. Greater care is exercised about such documents.

Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: May I inquire if it is the purpose of the Court to have the affidavit served upon the prosecution as well before the witness is produced?

THE PRESIDENT: That point has been raised in chambers. I told you it would be sufficient if you served the Judges. If the Judges think otherwise they will so direct.

Mr. Tavenner.

20

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

TADASHI KATAKURA, called as a
witness on behalf of the defense, resumed
the stand and testified through Japanese
interpreters as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued:)

MR. TAVENNER: May I ask the reporter to read the last question and answer?

(Whereupon, the question and answer were read by the official court reporter as follows:

"Q Well, it is a fact, is it not, that Colonel ITAGAKI knew at the time of the outbreak of the incident that the Chinese had declared a non-resistance policy?

"A Not from what Colonel ITAGAKI reported to
the commander-in-chief of the Kwantung Army, or
from what he spoke to me about.")

Q General KATAKURA, to my last question regarding the knowledge of Colonel ITAGAKI of the non-resistance attitude of the Chinese you replied that you had no knowledge from ITAGAKI that he knew of such. Now, did you learn from a telegram that was sent from Mukden on the morning of September 19th to the Japanese Foreign Ministry in Tokyo that Colonel ITAGAKI had such

## information?

A I should make a slight correction and make a very clear answer to that question.

Q Thank you.

A During the daytime of the 19th when Gommanding General HONJO arrived in Mukden Colonel ITAGAKI made a brief report on the military situation and with respect to his negotiations with Consul-General HAYASHI. Then on the same day Consul-General HAYASHI called on Commander-in-Chief HONJO and spoke of the incident involving the company, Fushun, as well as about this matter. This was a very brief and simple reference that was made.

Then from Tokyo there came instructions to the effect that since there were very strange reports which were emanating from the South Manchuria Railway, the Kwantung Administrative Office, and other organs, that all matters should be thoroughly investigated.

Q Will you answer my question, please? Did you learn from a telegram sent from Mukden on the 19th, the morning of the 19th, that Colonel ITAGAKI did know of the Chinese proposals, that is, proposals of non-resistance?

A Such a telegram did not come.

Q I am not speaking of a telegram coming to

2

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

Mukden; I am speaking of one being sent from Lukden. Do you mean from Mukden to Tokyo? 

3

5

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

I am speaking of telegram No. 624, from Consul General HAYASHI to Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA on the morning of September 19, in evidence as Part I of Exhibit 181.

A I am not familiar with that evidence, that exhibit. Will you inform me of the contents?

I will read Exhibit 181, Part I:

"Referring to my despatch telegram No. 623: In view of the fact that it was proposed several times from the Chinese side that this matter be settled in a peaceful way, I phoned to Staff Officer SAKAGAKI /T.N. Probably a mistake for ITAGAKI/ and said that since Japan and China had not yet formally entered into a state of war and that, moreover as China had declared that she would act upon the nonresistance principle absolutely, it was necessary for us at this time to endeavor to prevent the aggravation of the incident unnecessarily, and I urged that the matter be handled through diplomatic channels, but the above-mentioned staff officer answered that since this matter concerned the prestige of the state and the army, it was the army's intention to see it through thoroughly because the Chinese Army had attacked the Japanese Army, although the Japanese Army would do their best to protect the foreign residents

2

5

7

8

9

11

12

14

16

18

17

19

21

22

23

25

here. Thus since he did not appear to readily accept /my proposal/, I repeated the above purport again and called his attention to it."

A With respect to that telegram, the purport of it became known to Colonel ANDO, Chief of the Military Service Section, when he arrived in Manchuria for purposes of investigation; and it was on that occasion that I became informed of that telegram.

However, as to the contents of that telegram, I learned very briefly and simply when Colonel ITAGAKI reported to Commander-in-Chief HONJO.

Q Now, did you also learn of the sending of another telegram by Consul General HAYASHI, this one around the 15th or 16th of September, to Tokyo, in which it was said in substance that a big event was to occur soon?

A Yes, I learned that a telegram to such an effect was sent when I called at the consulate general in Mukden together with Chief of Staff MIYAKE on the 20th of September.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: May we have that telegram that the prosecutor has referred to identified, if the prosecutor can give us the exhibit number?

THE PRESIDENT: What is the number?

•

MR. TAVENNER: The telegram has not been introduced in evidence. At the present time we have not located it, though we are searching for it.

THE PRESIDENT: You should not cross-examine him on a telegram you haven't presently in your possession.

MR. TAVENNER: The witness himself in his examination in chief prepared us for cross-examination on this subject by his mentioning of the sending of a message to Tokyo after the 14th of September. The matter is in evidence by the prosecution to this extent, that General TANAKA testified that such a message had been received in Tokyo. Now, this witness has testified he knew of the message.

MR. BROOKS: I would like to renew my objection, and ask the prosecutor to check with the witness what message he is referring to. He is assuming something the witness is not clear on, the record is not clear on.

THE PRESIDENT: You had better clear that up.

Q I asked you the question, if you knew of a telegram being sent from Consul General HAYASHI on the 15th or 16th of September to Tokyo regarding an incident or an occasion which was likely to occur in

the near future. I believe I used the word "a big incident." And I understood you to reply that you did know of such a telegram.

A From what you have just said, I should like to make a slight correction in what I said. What I learned was of three telegrams which had been sent out from Mukden by the consul general on the morning of the 19th of September.

TRO.

Spratt & Yelden

Q In your testimony in chief you told us about the writing of a letter by HAYASHI to the Commander in Chief prior to the breaking out of the incident and to the sending of a message to Tokyo. Now tell us about this message to Tokyo.

A Consul General HAYASHI on the 17th of September on the one hand sent a letter to the Commander in Chief of the Kwantung Army and on the other hand after the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident he sent out a series of three telegrams to Tokyo on the night of the 18th in connection with this incident, also the Fushun Incident, together with a message which he had sent out on the 17th -- that is, the series of three telegrams also included what he had written to General HONJO on the 17th of September.

- Q When did General TATEKAWA arrive in Manchuria?
- A The night of the 18th of September.
- Q Was not he sent to Manchuria because of reports received in Tokyo that an incident was going to occur?

A The purpose of General TATEKAWA's mission was not known until he arrived in Manchuria. As for the Kwantung Army it received a telegram on the 17th of September saying that as TATEKAWA was going to

Manchuria he would like to have Colonel ITAGAKI or Lieutenant Colonel ISHIHARA go to Mukden for purposes of liaison.

Now, will you please answer my question.

Why was it that General TATEKAWA was sent to

Manchuria? Was it not because reports had been
received in Tokyo that an incident was likely to
occur and he was asked to try to stop the Kwantung
Army in its plans?

A Because of the fact that various wild rumors were afloat in Tokyo following the Captain NAKAMURA Incident, General TATEKAWA was sent to Manchuria in order to cope with the situation. As for the Kwantung Army it was unable to understand on what grounds, positively on what grounds, TATEKAWA was sent to Manchuria.

Q As far as you know then TATEKAWA's mission to Manchuria had no connection with Consul General HAYASHI's telegram if he sent one prior to that time?

A No connection.

Q Is it not true that Consul General HAYASHI's life was in danger as a result of the feeling on the part of the Kwantung Army against him by reason of his messages?

A I have met Consul General HAYASHI very

3

1

2

6

8

,

10

12

13

15

16

18

20

22

23

25

frequently. I have never heard anything of that kind from him.

Q Was it not true that even the Commander in Chief of the Kwantung Army was restricted to quarters at the time that the so-called incident broke?

A On the night of the 18th of September, as I have testified before, the Commander in Chief returned to his official residence after a nine o'clock inspection and that I went to the Chief of Staff to report and when I further took the report to the Commander in Chief he was taking a bath when I reported on the telephone call from Mukden; and when Commander in Chief HONJO arrived at the Kwantung Army headquarters near midnight, about midnight, on the 18th he came alone, unescorted, with his aide-decamp SUMITOMO.

Q Is it not true that Colonel ITAGAKI and ISHIHARA were the ones really who controlled the policies of the Kwantung Army?

A Colonel ITAGAKI was in charge of liaison or public relations with the outside; Lieutenant Colonel ISHIHARA was in charge of operations. In the Japanese army it was the custom of the high command not to have any officer interfere with the work of an officer in charge. For instance, if the officer

is in charge of operations it was the custom not to have any other officer interfere in his work. That was the custom prevailing at that time. Correction: not "interfere," but if the officer was in charge of operations it was the custom created by the high command to prohibit that officer --

THE MONITOR: It was customary at that time which was established by the high command not to let any other people know about the operation aside from the officer in charge.

Q Let us proceed now again with the ANDO investigation. You stated that the fourth inquiry related to the report that action of the Kwantung Army had been taken so swiftly that it appeared preparations had been made in peacetime. Do you know how the Tokyo government received such a report?

A According to the explanation given by Colonel ANDO this was a question addressed by Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA to the War Minister, MINAMI.

wer the west to at a most and anciend whather

Q In your testimony in chief you stated that it was a report that had been made. Do you desire now to change that statement?

A As to where Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA got his report or information in making this sudden request of the War Minister we do not know, but he must have received some information from some source.

Q Now, you testified in your examination in chief that you accompanied General HONJO in September 1932 to the palace of the Emperor.

A Yes.

Q Just a minute. I have not asked you the question.

A Yes, I said so.

Q Is it true that the Emperor on that occasion asked General HONJO whether the incident in Manchuria was the result of a plot on the part of the Kwantung Army?

A The inquiry made by his Majesty, the Emperor, of General HONJO was not -- did not refer to any definite plot. He merely inquired that there were rumors to the effect that the incident was the result of a plot and inquired whether that was true or not.

.

Q Will you answer my question? I will repeat it if there is any uncertainty about it.

Did the Emperor inquire of General HONJO if the incident in Manchuria was the result of a plot on the part of the Kwantung Army? Out of fairness to you I will say that I am reading from a transcript of your testimony on page 19,029.

A Yes, there was such an inquiry, but I think that the language was not sufficient.

Emphasis should be placed on the word "rumor."

The inquiry was to the effect that he had heard rumors that it was the result of some plot, and he asked whether those rumors were true or not.

Q That was one year after the incident had occurred, and many months after the Cabinet had accepted the Kwantung Army's explanation of what had occurred, was it not?

A Yes, that was one year after the incident.

Q And after the Kwantung Army's official explanation of the incident had been made also; is not that true?

A Yes.

Q Then the Emperor saw fit to make further inquiries after the matter had been officially determined by the Kwantung Army and the War Ministry,

A Well, I do not know all the details of the situation then, but the discussion that was held was a very informal one.

and the Cabinet; isn't that true?

Kwantung Army in Manchuria, you were asked the question in your examination in chief as to whether there were prisoners of war camps, to which you replied, page 18,997 of the transcript, "There were no such things as prisoners of war." And you further replied that the reason was that those who took a hostile attitude toward the Japanese would be punished, but those who had ceased resistance would be welcomed and absorbed. Does this mean that all those who took a hostile attitude were punished by death and that was the only reason there were no prisoners of war?

A My meaning was this: of course there would be some killed or wounded as a result of combat; however, if I am to describe the situation in Manchuria at that time, many troops surrendered in groups; some escaped, and therefore, they would generally fall into the three categories of killed and wounded, those who surrendered in groups, and those who escaped or missing -- that is,

3

5

6

8

9

11

12

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

25

the Chinese troops I am referring to. And I also implied when I spoke of surrendering soldiers, that is, soldiers surrendering in groops -- my meaning that they were not prisoners of war is that, unlike regular officers, they did not carry --

THE MONITOR: By that I only wanted to stress that they were different from regular troops; that is to say, that these surrendering troops were unlike regular armies and troops which could be seen on the battlefield, that is, their method of fighting is different.

Q That is not in response to my question.

I asked you, if those captured were either punished or welcomed and there were no prisoners of war, did that mean that those who were punished were massacred or killed?

A No, I did not mean that in that sense at all.

Q How were they punished?

A Are you referring to those who surrendered in groups?

Q I am referring to those who were not welcomed and absorbed and who resisted Japanese arms.

A Those who resisted the Japanese troops and

did not surrender against such troops, the fighting of course continued vigorously. The situation on the battlefield is rather strange.

Q All right. That is all I want to ask-you about that.

THE PRESIDENT: What are you referring to, those who showed a hostile attitude after capture?

THE WITNESS: No, I am not referring to

Q Well, what punishment was given to those who were hostile?

those who were hostile after capture.

A Those who showed a hostile attitude were still enemies, and therefore not under our control.

Q In other words, you either absorbed them or you put them to death, didn't you?

A There were only three alternatives: to absorb them; to have them surrender, or to fight them to the end and repulse them; or else there were troops which dispersed and escaped.

Q I want to ask you a question or two now regarding the conference that you spoke of between General HONJO and Ambassador YOSHIZAWA in January of 1932. You referred to that conference as being a very formal one in which Ambassador YOSHIZAWA, you say, was requested to take back to Tokyo three

important points. Now, as a matter of fact, do you not know that there was no formal conference whatever and that there was no message sent back to Tokyo through Ambassador YOSHIZAWA?

A I did not say that it was a formal conversation. It was a consultation.

Kapleau & Goldberg

1

2

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0	Poss	sibly I	should	have s	aid that	you
describe	d it	formel	ly. The	exact	lenguege	used by
you was	that	it was	an impo	rtant	conference	e in
which						

- A It was an important conversation but not a formal one.
- Q (Continued) in which General HONJO transmitted an important message to the ambassador?
- A Yes, but Ambassador YOSHIZAWA did not completely support them. He merely understood what General HONJO told him and said that he would try to de whatever he could, that was all.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner, a colleague desires the following question to be put to the witness: Were the soldiers who surrendered but who refused to cooperate with the Japanese thereafter punished with death?

- A There was no case of non-resisting Japan -- the Japanese after surrender.
- Then, you still refuse to state what occurred to prisoners after their surrender or capture?
- After surrender, as I have testified before, some of these surrendered soldiers became
  honest, good peasants working on the land. Some
  became police officers attached to the various

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

. .

17

18

19

20

22

23 24

25

provincial governments. Some joined the armed forces of the various independent armies, that is, armies working for independence. However, I am not familiar with minute details. Whatever it is, there were none in Japanese hands.

- What about those who were punished?
- A As to those to be punished, some were for the time being confined by the Japanese or transferred and confined by Chinese organs. Of course the situation differed, depending on the time.
- O Then, there were prisoner-of-war camps?
- 1 No.
- In your testimony in chief you referred to the existence of a special fund as being available for expenses of intelligence work, cost of patrolling, and for various reception purposes. Was this special fund ever used for any other purposes?
- A No.
- Who was the custodien of this fund?
- I The person in charge of this fund was the Chief of Staff, Colonel IT/G/KI and the indendance officer attached to the staff.
- Wes this special fund sometimes referred to as the KIMITSUHI fund?
  - ! Yes.

2

. 3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In referring to the expenditure of money by the Kwantung Army to promote independence movements, you stated, in substance, that the Kwantung frmy was at a loss because it had no money te spend for such purposes, and then you said there was 50,000 yen a year allotted to that fund. Wasn't that enough for a beginning? As I wasn't the officer in charge of the fund, I cannot give any very exact figures, but I seid that it was -- the 50,000 was, roughly, the amount that was allotted for the purpose as expenditures for the Kwentung / rmy in peace time; and this special fund wasn't used at all for the independence movement, and I just gave an example of its use before the Incident. Now, you stated that Colonel ITAGAKI, after first explaining the real intentions of the Japanese, induced or persuaded Ma Shan-shan to become the

Wer Minister of the so-called new state. (Whereupon, the witness started to reply in Japanese.)

Just a minute. Were you present at the conference?

A. I was not present at the conference.

O If you were not present I do not desire to
ask you any questions about what occurred there.
But I will ask you if this Manchurian by the name of
Me Chen-shan ectually became the first War Minister
A Yes.
0 Who was his Vice-Minister and what was his
netionelity?
A The Vice-Minister was a Manchurian, but I
don't recall his name at the moment. If you will
give me time I might recall it.
Or How much time?
A Until I recell. (Pause)
0 Well, let us prss it by.
That other ministers in the Manchurian
form of government besides the War Minister were
there?
Cheng Hsigo-hsu, prime minister
O Just a moment. I didn't ask for the names
I intended to ask for the names of the ministries,
that is, Foreign Ministry different types of
ministries.
A Foreign Affairs Department, Civilian
Affairs Department, Finance Department, Industrial
Department, Transportation Department, Justice
Donantmont

1	O Is that all?
2	1 Yes. As fer as the government departments
3	are concerned, yes.
4	Was there a Vice-Minister for each minis-
5	try?
6	At the in the early stage of the estab-
7	lishment of the state and the government there were
8	some departments which had vice-ministers and some
9	which had not.
10	O Isn't it a fact that in each instance where
11	there was a Vice-Minister the Vice-Minister was a
12	Japanese?
13	In the early stage of the new state they
14	were Manchurians, and Japanese became Vice-Ministers
15	later on. They were all Manchurians, at least up
16	until fugust, 1932, when we left Manchuria.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Q Are you related by blood or marriage to any of the accused?

A Yes, by marriage.

Q To whom?

A General MINAMI.

MR. TAVENNER: No further questions.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: There is one question upon the POW.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. T. OKAMOTO:

Q Mr. Witness, you testified a while ago that in cases where punishment should be meted out to prisoners of war, to soldiers after their surrender, they would be held either by the Japanese side or the Chinese side.

THE MONITOR: They were either confined by the Japanese or transferred to the Chinese authorities.

Q In the course of the direct examination,
Mr. Witness, you used the word -- used a certain
word which was applied in case of hostile acts on
the part of the Chinese troops, and that was rendered
as "punishment". Did you not mean -- didn't you mean
punishment in some other sense when you used the
word?

THE MONITOR: Japanese Court Reporter.

(Whereupon, the last question was read by the Japanese court reporter.)

Q In response to a question from me during the course of the examination in chief did you not mean when you said punitive actions against hostile activities or hostile acts on the part of the enemy, the word was translated as "punishment".

Did you not mean punishment in a different sense?

MR. TAVENNER: If your Honor pleases, this is not cross-examination. The question is grossly leading.

THE PRESIDENT: It is leading, but it is not as objectionable as it might be. It does not suggest a particular kind of punishment.

What did you mean, Witness?

THE WITNESS: I did not refer to them after their surrender. I was referring to them when they were continuing hostile enemy activities. If I should use a different word, those who resisted were enemies of the Japanese troops and those who surrendered were welcomed into our fold under the principle of Japan-Manchurian friendship.

Q In the course of the cross-examination by the prosecutor the word "absorb" was used. Would

3

4

6

.

9

10

12

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

you explain the meaning of the word in Japanese?

A I meant -- I used the word "absorb" in the sense that these soldiers would be absorbed into society in general after pledging cooperation with our side and pledging to act in unison with our side.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: That is all, your Honor.

I ask that the prisoner be released on the usual terms. Excuse me, that the witness be released on the usual terms.

THE PRESIDENT: He is at liberty on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

THE PRESIDENT: The Members of the Tribunal investigating the allegations by the defense that they lacked facilities would like to meet the counsel representing the defense in Chambers immediately after this adjournment.

MR. BROOKS: I have sent one of the attorneys around to the various offices and the members of the defense will be in there, I think, as soon as Court recesses, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Only a few. The spokesmen who appeared before me in Chambers will be sufficient, I take it, Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: I think he is ill at the present time. Did you refer to Mr. Logan?

THE PRESIDENT: I referred to spokesmen.

MR. BROOKS: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The adjournment that we are about to enter will be until Wednesday, the 2nd of April. That is understood.

MR. BROOKS: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.

MR. RCBERTS: Mr. President, I believe that some of the counsel, perhaps I just should speak for myself, would like to make it clear to the Court that we do not oppose the putting of testimony by affidavit because of the mechanics involved only. If that point is to be covered at the conference in Chambers, I believe as many as possible should be there.

THE PRESIDENT: That point will not be adverted to, Mr. Roberts. We want to discuss the mechanical difficulties really which you say are impeding your progress or will, if you have to give all your evidence in affidavit.

MR. ROBERTS: That is why I made the statement that all counsel, I believe, do not agree that that is the only reason for their opposition, that

the attempt of the Court to change the rules in the middle of the trial, they thought, was a deprivation of the rights of the accused under the Charter.

THE PRESIDENT: Not the attempt but determination not to change any rules, but to adopt a certain form of procedure consistent with a fair trial to the accused.

We will adjourn until Wednesday, the 2nd of April, at 0930.

(Whereupon, at 1555, an adjournment was taken until Wednesday, 2 April 1947, at 0930.)